

(d) the cost of the present establishment for the Power and Lighting Station at Chikballapur?

A.—The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, ELECTRICAL DEPARTMENT (Diwan Bahadur N. N. Ayyangar).—

(a) 235 K. V. A.

(b) (i) 80 K. V. A.

(ii) About Rs. 19,000 per annum.

(c) The establishment charges do not depend upon the present demand in the town. The existing establishment is the minimum that is required for managing a high tension station and it makes no difference if the full capacity of the station is not utilised.

(d) About Rs. 10,000 per annum.

Mr. V. VENKATASAMY CHETTY.— Is it not possible to reduce the cost of establishment?

The DEWAN.—We will consider that.

EXTENSION OF THE SESSION.

At the request of several members, the **DEWAN** announced that the session would be extended on the following day (15th October 1935), the House sitting from 8 to 11 A.M.

REPRESENTATIONS—(contd.).

No. 50.—Reduction of licence fees for the removal of firewood from forests.

MESSRS. A. V. NANJUNDA SETTY, Arkalgud Taluk; **P. BASAVE GOWDA** and **A. KENCHAPPA**, Arsikere Taluk; **H. B. GUNDAPPA** and **B. DONDE GOWDA**, Hassan Taluk; **S. P. BRAHMAPP**, Hassan Municipality; **MAHOMED AKBAR SHERRIFF**, S. C. BELURIAH and **K. A. RAHIM**, Minorities; **B. N. CHELUVU GOWDA**, **M. NANJAPPA** and **B. L. HUTCHAPPA**, Channarayapatna Taluk; **B. N. BORANNA GOWDA**, Belur Taluk; **KARIAPPA GOWDA** and **K. RAMANNA**, Hole-Narsipur Taluk; **NARASIMHAIAH**, Hole-Narsipur Municipality; **B. K. SOME GOWDA** and **B. DEVAPPA GOWDA**, Manjarabad Taluk; and **A. S. NANJUNDAPPA**, Alur Sub-Taluk.

Mr. A. V. NANJUNDA SETTY represented that the existing rate of licence fee of 10 annas for the removal of a cart load of firewood from State and District forests was very high and prayed that it be reduced to 4 annas per cart load.

Messrs. M. S. PUTTARAMA SETTY, RANGASWAMI SETTY and **C. R. NIRVANAPPA SETTY** supported the representation. **Mr. M. S. PUTTARAMA**

R.A.

SETTY suggested that the fee be abolished altogether.

Mr. B. DONDE GOWDA observed that especially in the eastern parts of the Channarayapatna Taluk very long distances had to be traversed before firewood in the forests were got at. Nearly two days would be wasted in the carts going to the forests and two days in returning, so that the cost of transit itself would be very high. A heavy fee payable in addition would only mean greater hardship to the villagers. The Government were not losing anything by permitting the firewood to be removed. In fact, whenever fire broke out in the forests, Government would necessarily have to spend a large sum of money for extinguishing it. If the forests were thinned down in such areas, occasions for such expenditure would not be many. Such being the case, he asked what the Government would lose if they accepted the representation and gave the relief asked for.

The CHIEF CONSERVATOR of FORESTS (Mr. M. Machaya) replied that the present rate of fee was being levied for a long time and that he did not think that there was any new hardship caused to the raiyats more especially since almost all of them were getting enough firewood for their own use from *hidwali* lands.

Mr. B. DONDE GOWDA pointed out that in addition to the licence fee an illegal levy of one anna was being collected by the vendors and guards on each cart which the raiyats dared not refuse.

Mr. M. MACHAYA said that those who paid such levies were as blame-worthy as those who collected them and that well-informed men ought not to encourage such practices.

Messrs. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA, M. S. PUTTARAMA SETTY and many others said that the levy had become a *mamool* practically in all districts and that in Periyapatna Taluk, for example, even a higher levy was being collected, not only in respect of firewood but also in respect of bamboo.

Mr. M. MACHAYA enquired whether the matter had been brought to the

notice of the higher officers of the department.

Mr. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA replied that it was not always easy to complain and prove the case.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matthan) thought that if such abuses were to be put an end to, some people must take the responsibility of bringing them to the notice of the authorities concerned. Otherwise the abuses were bound to continue. It was also not right that anybody who knew of the prevalence of such practices should fail to bring them to the notice of the authorities.

Mr. N. G. SANJIVIAH, opposing the representation, observed that round about Bannerghatta, on and near the roadsides, all trees had been removed, perhaps unnoticed by forest guards, and sold in Bangalore City for high prices. Even if they did it by permission, they could easily pay 10 annas and get a licence in view of the high prices they obtained. By this way, almost all the trees on the road sides had been cut off. He therefore requested that no additional facilities should be given to them for the destructive work they were doing. He was of opinion that the licence fee might be enhanced.

Mr. B. N. BORANNA GOWDA suggested that the rate of licence fee might be reduced, as prayed for, at least in cases where the firewood was removed by a raiyat for his own use and not for being sold to others.

Mr. K. MATTHAN asked how it was possible to know the purpose in view in each case and enforce two different rates.

Mr. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA said that by reducing the rate the Government would be helping the raiyat to find a subsidiary occupation. The present rate of licence fee, coupled with other costs, hardly left any profit to him.

Mr. K. MATTHAN observed that the question had to be considered not merely from the point of view of the raiyat. If it was urged that a reduction in the rate should be given with a view to provide a subsidiary occupation for the raiyat, the question

might as well be raised why any levy should be made at all. To-day members were praying for a reduction of the rate to 4 annas, to-morrow they might ask for a further reduction to 2 annas and some time later for the total abolition of it. But apart from the immediate convenience of the raiyat, he would ask whether it was wise to denude forests? From the point of view of the State and the people as a whole, forests were a property to be preserved for all time and it would be folly to destroy them. In these circumstances, he said that it was not possible for Government to reduce the fee as prayed for.

No. 51.—Conversion of Chikkanahalli *manna* jungle into a District forest.

MESSRS. BASAPPA and DASAPPA, Heggaddevankote Taluk.

Mr. BASAPPA represented that Chikkanahalli *manna* jungle, which was situated on the border of Mysore and Heggaddevankote Taluks, was quite useless being full of lantana and other scrub jungle without a blade of grass. Still, the villagers on the borders of the jungle, having no *gomal* for their village cattle, had to drive their cattle to the jungle. And as the village cattle of Mavinahalli, Chuncherayana-hundi, Bettadabeedu, Kaniyanahundi, Pura, Koladahundi, Deggalahundi, Mandanahalli, Gujagowdanapura, Haruvalli, etc., had to go to this forest alone for water, these cattle were stopped by the Forest officers and herded in small pounds, as elephants were herded at khedda, and *hulbanni* fine, pound fee and fodder fee, etc., were levied. The raiyats were thus being put to great hardship. To obviate this, he prayed that this State forest be converted into a District forest, if necessary after an examination of the question once again by an officer of any other department. He added that at the rate of Re. 1 per head of cattle, as much as Rs. 500 were levied as fine on one single day. First the authorities concerned did not ask for the fee but later they drove all the cattle to the cattle pounds and levied

heavy fines. It might no doubt be said that the raiyats should not have taken their cattle in the first instance to the forest because it was a State forest. But that jungle was only recently converted into a State forest. Some villagers, not knowing that probably, took their cattle, with the result that they were fined very heavily and the amount was also collected by *zulum*.

The **CHIEF CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS (Mr. M. Machaya)** replied that he would enquire into that matter.

Mr. DASAPPA requested that free grazing might be permitted in that forest, as there was no *gomal* for most of the surrounding villages.

The **FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina Diwan Dahadur K. Matthan)** replied that no free grazing could be permitted in State forests except under distress conditions.

No. 52.—Formation of a committee to suggest a modification of forest rules.

MESSRS. BAGAMAME DEVA GOWDA and **M. SIDDALINGAPPA SETTY**, Chikmagalur Taluk; **N. M. SIVALINGAPPIAH** and **K. THIMME GOWDA**, Kadur Taluk; **HANJI BASAPPA**, Tarikere Taluk; **M. S. DYAVE GOWDA**, Koppa Taluk; **K. MALLE GOWDA** and **M. HUTCHE GOWDA**, Mudgere Taluk; **M. THIMMIAH**, Tarikere Municipality; **D. V. HALAPPA**, Birur Municipality; and **C. R. NIRVANAPPA SETTY**, Special Interest.

Mr. N. M. SIVALINGAPPIAH prayed that as some of the forest rules were a source of great hardship to the people in rural areas in the malnad, a committee be appointed to propose modifications to them so as to alleviate the hardships.

Mr. Tudki RAMANNA GOWDA represented that the line of demarcation in the case of many forests had come very close to agricultural lands in villages in the malnad so much so that wild animals were giving a lot of trouble to the villagers. No *shikar* also was being done. When the matter was represented to the Deputy Commissioner, he no doubt sympathised with the raiyats but said that the matter was one pertaining to the Forest Department. And when the Forest officers were approached, they replied that the matter could have been brought to their notice at the time of

the forest settlement. The net result was that trouble to the villagers by these wild animals continued. Even the Malnad Raiyats' Privileges rules were not worked in a liberal spirit. There were thus many points to be considered which could be done exhaustively only by a committee. He therefore prayed that a committee be appointed as suggested.

Mr. MEER MAHOMED SAHIB also supported the above views. He added that even the concessions which were formerly being shown under the Malnad Raiyats' Privileges rules had been curtailed of late.

The **FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matthan)** replied that the Malnad Raiyats' Privileges rules had not been modified in any respect.

Mr. V. V. IYER pointed out another difficulty experienced by the malnad raiyats. Jungle wood and other materials for construction of houses were not available in the District forests because almost all had been already removed, and removal of such materials from State forests meant almost prohibitive expenditure to the raiyats, not to speak of long distances to be traversed before reaching them. In Shimoga Taluk, firewood was not at all available; even bamboo required for putting up fencing was not available. He thought that such difficulties were common to many parts of the State and hence a committee might be appointed as prayed for.

The **CHIEF CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS (Mr. M. Machaya)** replying observed that two difficulties had been pointed out by members in the course of the discussion. One was that the demarcation lines were too close to agricultural lands, as a result of which wild animals gave a lot of trouble to the raiyats. But he did not believe that that was so. If, however, there were any cases in which there was real grievance of that kind, he said that they might be brought to the notice of the department and he would see that the grievance was redressed. But generally speaking, he observed that according to the Malnad Raiyats'

Privileges rules, dry wood could be removed from all district jungles.

Mr. Tudki RAMANNA GOWDA observed that there was no district jungle round about Tirthahalli and that demarcation lines in the Thunga block and certain other State forests in Thirthalli Taluk were too near to occupied lands.

Mr. M. MACHAYA replied that State forests were not constituted without consulting the Deputy Commissioner in regard to the actual needs of the localities concerned.

Mr. Tudki RAMANNA GOWDA said that the difficulties represented were real and that, whether a committee was appointed as requested or not, they had to be obviated immediately.

Mr. M. MACHAYA replied that all difficulties might first be represented to the local authorities who would surely consider them sympathetically.

Mr. Tudki RAMANNA GOWDA pointed out that representations were being made to the revenue authorities for many years past but that they were still pending.

Mr. K. MATTHAN replied that some of the members themselves would agree that the appointment of a committee was neither necessary nor useful. In 1917 a committee had been appointed of which the speaker himself was Chairman. There were malnad representatives also on the committee. That committee had found that there was nothing in the policy of Government which raiyats in the malnad could legitimately complain of. And that policy had not undergone any change during these years. The formation of another committee, therefore, would serve no useful purpose. There might be individual grievances here and there, but they could be rectified if brought to the notice of the Deputy Commissioner and the Chief Conservator of Forests.

No. 53.—Security from bidders from British India during sales.

MESSRS. SORAPPA, Sirs Taluk, and **SHEIK MOHADEEN SAB**, Sirs Municipality.

Mr. SORAPPA suggested that security for the full amount of the

sale should be demanded from bidders from British India at sales held in Mysore as was being done in the case of bidders from Mysore in connection with sales held in British India.

Mr. G. SHANKARA SETTY pointed out the difficulties experienced by local bidders in British Indian sales and the facilities enjoyed by outsiders in the matter of bidding at sales held in Mysore. Though solvency certificates were issued by the Mysore officers to local bidders participating in British Indian sales, the British Indian officers did not accept those certificates but insisted upon the surety of some solvent contractor residing in British India. But in the case of bidders from British India at sales in Mysore, no such restriction was imposed on them. They paid the first instalment and went back to British India, but if in any case they did not pay the balance due within the stipulated time, there was no provision for Government to collect it as arrears of land revenue as they could collect from local bidders. If at all, it would have to be recovered through civil courts. He therefore prayed that full security be demanded from bidders from British India at all sales held in Mysore.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matthan) replied that full security was being insisted upon in respect of toll-gate contracts and added that the question how far the present rules in respect of excise contracts could be tightened in the case of outside bidders would be considered.

No. 54.—Grading steeply the rate of income-tax in the case of incomes above Rs.10,000 per year.

Mr. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR, Special Interest.

Mr. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR prayed that the rate of income-tax be steeply graded in the case of incomes above Rs. 10,000 per year. He observed that the principle of the representation was that if the poor must live the rich must undergo some sacrifice. Those getting an income of more than

Rs. 800 per month, he thought, could well afford to pay a higher rate of income-tax than at present. If the present rate of 6 pies per rupee was increased to one anna per rupee, a sum of about Rs. 1 lakh would be derived. The *per capita* income in India at the present time was as low as between Rs. 4 and Rs. 5. Such being the case, he thought that the rich ought to undergo some little sacrifice and help their brethren. And the income derived could be utilised for beneficial purposes like providing drinking water wells, roads and other facilities in rural parts, thereby increasing the comforts of the masses. He agreed that some rich people were giving donations for beneficent purposes. But he would request other rich people—industrialists, merchants, minors, officers, and lawyers too—also to make similar sacrifices.

Mr. S. K. VENKATARANGA IYENGAR supported the representation. He observed that with regard to the principle of the representation itself there could possibly be no two opinions. The rate of income-tax in British India was higher than that in Mysore and by accepting this representation the Government would only be removing the inequality.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA, in further supporting the representation, observed that if it was accepted, the Government would be getting a substantial amount of additional revenue, and they could utilise it for spreading elementary education.

Mr. J. MAHOMED IMAM opposed the representation. He said that he did not know why Mr. Bhashyam Aiyangar, who was always pleading for lightening the burden of taxation on people, was pleading on the present occasion for an increase in the rate of income-tax which was the most unwelcome of all taxes. The present rate itself was very high, having been increased from 3 pies to 6 pies and he was of opinion that it should not be further increased even slightly. Next, he pointed out that income-tax was levied not on net income but on gross income. What one earned was taken into consideration but not what one

had to spend. If expenditure also was taken into account, it would be found that in most cases there would be nothing left to be taxed. Such being the case, if the rates were enhanced still further, many of the merchants were sure to be hit harder than they were already. Under these circumstances, he requested the Government not to accept the representation.

Mr. P. SUBBARAMA CHETTY said that he did not know whether to thank the mover of the representation for the suggestion or to blame him. He pointed out that already the country was split into too many divisions on account of the various castes and creeds, on account of which the progress of the country was retarded. The income-tax had further sub-divided the people under the categories of rich and poor and the present proposal sought to divide each sub-division into still further sub-divisions. It remained to be seen how many more classes were going to be created in days to come. There was a time when it was considered that wealthy persons were a source of prosperity to the State because they could be influenced to give their savings for beneficent purposes, such as construction of *dharmasalas*, maternity hospitals, etc. At the present time they were not in a position to do such charities on a large scale on account of the slump in trade and general economic depression. And in future, if taxation was increased, they would be utterly unable to lay by anything so that donations for such beneficent purposes would be altogether out of the question. The present was hardly the time for adding to the burden of merchants and traders and he requested Mr. Bhashyam Aiyangar not to press the matter.

Mr. M. S. PUTTARAMA SETTY, who also opposed the representation, said that even if the representation was accepted, the object in view could not be gained. The tax related either to highly paid officers of Government or to merchants. In the one case, the officers, on account of having to pay more tax, would naturally resort to more frequent touring and would

therefore be entitled to more travelling allowance. In the other case, the merchants and *sahucars* would have to increase the sale prices of commodities so that the consumers, most of whom were poor people, would be hard-hit. On this account, he requested the mover not to press the matter.

Mr. N. G. SANJIVIAH was afraid that even if the rates of income-tax were enhanced, there would be no guarantee that the extra revenue would be utilised for the benefit of the poor people, such as on primary education. Instead, therefore, of supporting an enhancement of the rates of income-tax, he would rather support the imposition of a profession tax if it was plainly proposed as a new levy.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY supported the representation on the principle that whoever was placed by Providence in a fortunate position owed it to the State to contribute liberally for the relief of the poor. As regards the defects of working in the Income-tax Department and the difficulties caused to the assesseees referred to by one of the previous speakers, he said that they could be got rectified by administrative action and they should not be advanced as a reason for rejecting the representation. In his opinion, the gradual awakening that was coming about in the political life of the country was sure to result in securing a prominent place for labour and a recognition of its just claims by capital. So far as the present position was concerned, well-to-do classes in England were paying an income-tax of about 5 shillings in the pound which was equivalent to 4 annas in the rupee; but what similar classes in India were paying was a negligible fraction thereof. He would not propose that the same rate of tax should be adopted in India also. In consideration of the fact that the average earning capacity of the Indian was proportionately smaller, this tax might go up to a maximum of one anna in the rupee. That seemed to him to be the idea of the mover also. He said that the present distribution of the burden of taxation was lop-sided. It was weigh-

ing heavily only on the poorer people. Government revenues seemed to be made up mainly of contributions from the rural population and yet they were being spent mostly for the benefit of the urban population. The position could be improved only if the urban classes also bore their share of the responsibility. It was but fair that well-to-do people in the State must be prepared to pay what their brethren in British India were paying. After all, the standard of life of people in British India and Mysore was practically the same. He therefore pleaded for the adoption of the rates of income-tax prevailing in British India. Mysore had copied several things from British India and could easily follow its example in respect of income-tax also.

Mr. M. A. GOPALASWAMI IYENGAR supported the proposal as it involved an important principle, *viz.*, the share of a subject's income which should be given back for the purposes of the State. He did not agree with the apprehension of some of the previous speakers that it would tend to alienate the sympathy of capitalists in the State. It was a universally recognised principle that there should be a proportionate sacrifice on the part of all if there was to be uniform progress, and economists had admitted the iniquity of imposing a uniform rate on both the middle and the wealthier classes. It was recognised everywhere that as the income increased, the rate of tax should also increase. It was up to the rich to make a heavier sacrifice in the interest of the State. He therefore prayed that the representation be accepted.

Messrs. T. RAMACHANDRA and JATHARE NAIK who also supported the representation wanted that the extra revenue from this source should be earmarked for the advancement of education and other services of the poorer classes.

Dharmapravartha M. L. NAGAPPA SETTY remarked that the mover would not have brought up this subject if he was going to be affected personally by it. This was a time, he said, when it had become very difficult for income-

tax assesseees to keep their position and prestige. Their financial stability had been shaken and they alone knew best how the levies already imposed were affecting them. The speaker knew of several cases where people had been assessed to income-tax even though they were not liable to it. Even well-established joint-stock companies were not getting on well and the position of private individuals was indeed much worse. With solitary exceptions here and there, such as the Mysore Sugar Company, shareholders of commercial concerns were finding it hard to prevent them from going into voluntary liquidation. This being so, he thought that it would not be right to propose an enhancement of tax. If the present assesseees were actually paying their income-tax, it was because the authorities refused to be convinced about the injustice of the levy despite the economic depression. At such a time, if higher rates were levied, the assesseees would naturally have to distribute the burden among the poorer people. This, he said would surely be a disservice rendered by the State to its subject. In this view he requested the mover to withdraw the representation.

Mr. Belur SRINIVASIENGAR emphasised that there was nothing wrong in the representation itself. To impose a uniform rate of tax on both the rich and middle classes was unsound economically. He was of opinion that Government were showing a sort of concession at present to people with an income of Rs. 10,000 and more, by assessing them at the same low rate of six pies in the rupee which applied to others with less income.

Mr. B. SRINIVASA RAO opposed the representation on the ground that a number of fresh levies were being imposed on the wealthier classes. Under the Workmen's Compensation Act, as amended, the employer would soon be called upon to pay compensation to coolies under certain circumstances and it would be very unjust to increase other taxes also. As newer burdens are imposed, it would be fair to give relief in a corresponding measure in other directions. For instance, for

longer distances on the railways, the fares charged were reduced. A similar principle, he said, should be followed in the case of taxes also. So far as the Government officers went, he was of opinion that they were, as a general rule, worse off economically. On the whole, this representation, if acted upon, would create discontent among certain classes of His Highness's subjects and he was therefore unable to support it.

Mr. L. VEMA REDDY pointed out that only well-to-do members of the Assembly had opposed the representation. He would remind them that in most cases, a good part of their wealth must have come from their ancestors, and money originally belonging to many a poor man must have gone into their hands in various ways. There was nothing wrong in the Government asking for a very small part of that money for being used for the benefit of the masses. It was necessary that money should always be circulating. It was not right to expect a poor man to continue to be poor for ever. Even by giving a little more of their money by way of tax, the rich would not materially suffer and by withholding such contribution, their comforts would not materially increase. The agriculturist was paying a good share of his income by way of tax and the speaker did not see why people earning Rs. 5,000 or more should not make a slightly larger contribution to the State than at present and benefit its subjects.

Mr. MUSTAPHA SAHIB spoke against the representation. He added that in practical working, the higher rate of income-tax prevailing in Madras were inducing assesseees to altogether evade the tax in various ways.

Sreemathi SAKAMMA drew attention to the fact that agricultural income was exempt from this tax and that it would apply only to incomes from other sources exceeding a certain limit. Under the existing conditions, the raiyats were passing through considerable difficulties and in order to afford them some relief, those who were well off must contribute something extra to the Government Treasury. She was

therefore inclined to agree to the enhanced rates of income-tax at least as a temporary measure. But she was very particular that the income thus derived must be ear-marked for expansion of primary education.

The COMMISSIONER of INCOME-TAX (Mr. D. Srinivasa Iyengar) stated, on behalf of Government, that the mover seemed to be unaware of the fact that income-tax in Mysore was already graded as follows :

Amount		Rate: per rupee
Rs.	Rs.	
5,000 to 10,000	...	4½ pies
10,000 to 15,000	...	6 "
15,000 to 20,000	...	7½ "
20,000 to 30,000	...	9 "
30,000 to 40,000	...	12 "
40,000 to 50,000	...	15 "
Above 50,000	...	18 "

After the Income-tax Regulation was enacted in the State, the rates were revised three times, the last revision having been agreed to by the Legislature in 1931. And in case the above rates were to be enhanced further, it would be necessary to bring up an amending bill before the two Constitutional Houses. It had also to be remembered that under the coming Federal Constitution, Income-tax would be an item of federal revenue and it would not be very advisable to alter the rates of income-tax in Mysore in the meanwhile. So far, at any rate, as the present time was concerned, he said that in view of the general economic depression, Government were not in favour of enhancing the rates of taxation immediately, though they would have no objection to reconsidering the question of rates later on if necessary.

RESOLUTIONS—(contd.).

No. 7.—**Khan Bahadur MAHOMED ABBAS KHAN**, commenting on the resolution, observed that though there was nothing improper in the Assembly praying for the appointment of a non-Brahmin Executive Councillor, the resolution coming as it did immediately after the issue of a notification relating to the elevation of a particular

officer to the Council, amounted to questioning the gracious orders of His Highness the Maharaja who alone was competent to make that appointment. He was afraid that it would not be consistent with their sense of loyalty if the people should show dissatisfaction in regard to matters of such import.

Secondly, considering the merit of the particular officer who had been elevated to the Executive Council, the speaker acknowledged that Mr. N. Madhava Rao was one of the most able and efficient officers in the State who had made a mark in all the responsible posts so far held by him. He was also an officer who had earned the confidence and respect of the public by his impartiality and sympathy and was certain to make a name in the bright days yet in store for him. For these reasons, he thought that there should be no hesitation on the part of the Assembly in heartily welcoming His Highness the Maharaja's decision to appoint Mr. Madhava Rao as an Executive Councillor in succession to Mr. Matthan.

In the next place, dealing with the suggestion made by certain members the previous day that, notwithstanding the fact that it would involve an extra expenditure of Rs. 30,000 annually, an additional Member of Council might be appointed, he said he had no objection to that being done. But before making such a request, he was of opinion that it would be graceful on the part of the Assembly to record, by a unanimous vote, its sense of satisfaction at the appointment of Mr. Madhava Rao and then make its further prayer in any form desired. His Highness was personally conversant with the comparative merits of all officers of Government and he was undoubtedly alive to the interests of the various communities in the State. So it was not competent for the Assembly to say that a particular kind of officer alone should be appointed to a particular post. The resolution as moved was also not clear as to whether it was a *non-Brahmin* officer whose elevation to the Council was wanted or the appointment of a *non-official* member. This, he said,